

## REMARKS

In the action of April 21, 2005, the examiner objected to the disclosure; rejected claims 25-29 and 35-38 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Sorton; rejected claims 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Fawcett et al; rejected claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Sorton in view of Fawcett et al, and rejected claims 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Jensen. The examiner indicated that 30-32 are allowable.

Applicant submits a new specification with the underlined headings underlined to show the added material. The new specification contains no new matter. This should remedy the objection of the examiner to the specification.

In response to the examiner's rejection of claims 25-29 and 35-38 as anticipated to Sorton, please note the amendment to claim 25. In the action, the examiner stated that the Sorton device has a retaining member (12) which could be rotated by loosening the nut on member (32) enough to allow the members (28,30) to come out of slot (34) so that its longitudinal axis is parallel with the longitudinal axis of the magnetic member. The examiner further indicated that this could be considered a "retracted" position. The Sorton device does not have a "rotatable retaining member", as now set forth in claim 25. The retaining member 12 of Sorton cannot freely move and must first be lifted away from member 32 to disengage from slot 34. The Sorton device may in fact be able to be reconfigured between two positions, but it is not rotatable as set forth in claim 25. Hence, claim 25 is patentable over Sorton, as are claims 26-29 and 35-38 which are dependent thereon.

In response to the examiner's rejection of claim 34 as anticipated by Fawcett, please note that claim 34 has been amended to require that the ferromagnetic material extends from one magnet in the pair of magnets to the other magnet in the pair of magnets; i.e., that the ferromagnetic material is in contact from one magnet to the next. As the examiner indicated in the action, Fawcett does not teach such a limitation. Hence, claim 34 is allowable.

With respect to the examiner's rejection of claims 20-24 as unpatentable over Jensen, the examiner stated that the device disclosed in Jensen helps to support the sheet material against the support because the sheet material is clamped between the support and

the device. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Jensen does not teach or suggest a magnetic holding device to hold the sheet material in place. If the device of Jensen were removed, the sheet material would still be supported since it is fixed in place, apart from the Jensen magnetic device. Accordingly, Jensen does not teach the step of using a magnetic holding device to hold the sheet material in position between the magnetic surfaces of the holding devices. Contrary to the examiner's statement, the protective guard 10 of Jensen is simply held in place against the sheet material. There is no disclosed step or function in which the guard 10 actually holds the sheet material in position, as set forth in the claims. Accordingly, claim 20 is patentable over Jensen. Since claims 21-24 are dependent upon claim 20, those claims are also allowable.

This is to request a three-month extension of time. Enclosed is the required fee of \$510.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 07-1900.

Respectfully submitted,  
JENSEN & PUNTIGAM, P.S.

By Clark A. Puntigam  
Clark A. Puntigam, #25,763  
Attorney for Applicant

(206) 448-3200  
Fax: (206) 441-5514  
2033 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, #1020  
Seattle WA 98121  
E-mail clark@jensenpuntigam.com

CAP:rml  
Enclosures: Substitute Specification  
Check  
Postcard